Pb. return

11/18/70

Dear Paul,

When you were kind enough to send me a copy of your 10/25 memo that I can read and willing to go to the extra cost to do this, I assumed you really wanted me to. Last night I finished with the proofs on hand and, instead of sleeping, as I should have, this morning, I got up to read and comment on it.

As I once told you, true friendship requires candor, so I am candid.

Having spent a large part of my adult life living with it to the point where I can qualify as a genuine expert-more time with it than you have with physics - I am an expert on shit. I have learned, from handling it from animals and observing it from humans, that short of total disposition, there is nothing you can do with it. Until it entirely decomposes, it remains shit. There is no perfume that hides its odor, no normal covering that prevents its squishing under and curling up onto the foot -nothing short of total decomposition changes it. It remains shit. Farmers call it manure (except when it comes from the bull, when they invariably call it bullshit), or they sometimes deviate with horses and chickens to call it by terms with which, after physics, you still remain familiar. Humans call it feces. But regardless of terminology, regardless of any effort to disguise (and only humans are dishonest enough to attempt disguising), it remains, despite man's best effort, no more and no less than shit.

You have resorted to perfume, but my foot gives me the answer my nose was prepared to not find. But soon my nose detected the true odor. You haven't hidden it or anything else. You have deceived yourself only. The first page is sufficient.

It makes me wonder why you have avoided certain answers of an affirmative kind, those incumbent upon you to prove in establishing the validity of your work, instead asking questions, why is it not so. And it tells me why you have never addressed my accusation, that you have a totally invalid thing you call a test, in which you have gone out of your way to be unfaithful to everything you allegedly are duplicating and testing. In no single area, no one test, no part of your test, do you in any sense duplicate what you say you are evaluating. I now know why you have shunned this, why, after all the many forceful criticisms, you do not address this, probably the first and most detailed, in any way. Does a former farmer have to tell a real, genuine physicist that he makes no test without fidelity, that science imposes certain requirements he must meet?

What you have done is try and hid shit with perfume and straw, seeking to deceive the nose and the foot. I repeat, nobody can be deceived. This remains something less respectable than Specter's work, less valid than Humes'. What it has is a slight touch of Fisher. In this form it remains what it was, an only slightly disguised attempt to validate what cannot be validated. It can be used for no other purpose, except, possibly, privately in ways of which I do not know, and will be so interpreted, as you know. You open with a sentence of complete irrelevance. What the hell difference does it make whether one can or cannot argue from "general principles" (whose-of what discipline-which?) that the fatal shot must have come from the front". There is available today sufficient evidence so that "general principles" can be no more than an effort to avoid facing the reality of the evidence. You debase the word, even for high school, in calling what you did an experiment. The answer to this sentence is, "so what?" You continue to "...it follows from the laws of physics that the shot must have come from the opposite direction." With apologies to the ladies who may see this, "fuck the laws of physics". They are relevant only when honestly used, and here they are not. They can't be used or misr

to replace the existing evidence. I ask you to show me the revelance of this stuff.

Your second paragraph is no more than a futile effort to pile more straw over the suit of the first. Even then you haven't enough to deceive the eye:"...all it says is that one particular argument that the shot came from the front is not v lid." This is a lie. But can you be unaware that this will not be used in any way other than "Warren Report Vaiidated"? And why do you prostitute your science to "prove" that "one particular argument", whic is no more than a straw man, may be "invalid" when ther remain others the validity of which cannot be questioned-and you do not? I began by teling you this was a fairies-and-needles boys treatment of flat-world science. I await your even pro forma denial. You and Hoover, who does not face the same simple challenge, about the actions of his agents. To then say, "That does not, of course, prove that the shot did not come from the front" (which you know the corrupt press and the sycophants, the only ones with a voice today, will ignore), is like saying, when an innocent, immature girl is raped with bestial violence, that all women have not been raped.

There is no point in detailed analysis, for you have established a x clear enough record of refusing to face the evidence against you. You parry and pretend, which is so unlike you. You do not respond.

I think it should here be sufficient to show only a single thing further-and from the first page alone. You lie, and you must know this. I therefore ask you why you lie, which again, is so utterly unlike you. If none of the others failed to call this to your attention, they must have been numb when they got to the bottom of the first page:

"It should be noted that we did not go around shooting at various targets until we found one that worked."

You most assuredly did!

You first tried gelatin-filled balloonso and they worked against you, so you tied another and ignored the baloons.

So that great man of Hiroshima decency, or incinerating morality,"sug-bested" the melons? Some science, his. Aside from its genera, contours, I again challenge you to give me some scientific validity for using a melon (remaining undescribed as to characteristics, variety, size-in any way) as a duplication of a human head in any work involving ballistics testing, shooting into it for a reaction.

It is past time for your affirmative defense of your work, beginning with the concept. You do not do it. Until you establish the avlidity of the premise, there is no point in going past the premise.

There are none among us I would consider less likely to lie than you. There are none I would consider less likely to do anything dishonest. I remain with the wonder why you have so left your character, the alternative being that I was wrong in my high estimate of your integrity and intelligence.

I have made my share of mistakes. Some I can come to see readily, others I have been unwilling to consider mistakes. There is none I am as unwilling to consider a mistake as my estimate of you. So, I again ask you as I have so often asked myself, why does Paul step so far out of character?

Why are you kidding and why are you trying to kid when a man with your training calls this claptrap an experiment? Still again I ask for the establishing of the basic validity of the comparison, without any reference to results. How can you call this a duplication, any valid method of measuring, evaluating, comparing-anything at all? Can it be that every molecule of your scientists body does not rebel when you call this a test, an experiment, and dare draw any conclusions from it? If not, then again I say, physicist, heal thyself, for you are sick. The alternative, corrupt, preparing for your own Hiroshima. I repeat what I want you to refute or face, that calling this science is akin to Hitler's doctors calling their work on humans science. Theirs, I tell you, is a more valid claim.

Until you show me that you do not lie on the first page, I shall read no further. Should I? Either show me that you didn't lie or tell me why you did. How could you possibly become Alvarez' handmaiden in so nefarious a project? Why did he develop this interest at just this time? The longer you delay answers, the more difficult they will be to face. And live with. I remain perplexed.